

**Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC)
Meeting Minutes**

(Approved by Council February 19, 2003)

August 21, 2002

8:35 a.m. to 12:05 p.m., East Conference Room, Joe R. Williams Building
700 West State Street, Boise, Idaho

The August 21, 2002, meeting of the Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC) was held in the East Conference Room of the Joe R. Williams Building, 700 West State Street, Boise, Idaho.

CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME

Dwight Bower, Acting Council Chairman and Idaho Transportation Department, who welcomed members and guests present, called the meeting to order.

ATTENDANCE

Members/Designates Present:

Dwight Bower, Idaho Transportation Dept.
Senator Hal Bunderson, Idaho Senate
Representative Lee Gagner, Idaho House
Ken Harward, Association of Idaho Cities
Dr. Marilyn Howard, Department of Education
Mary Elizabeth Jones, Filer, Idaho
Karl Kurtz, Dept. of Health and Welfare
Representative Elmer Martinez, Idaho House

Roger Parks, JR Simplot Company
John Peay, Idaho Supreme Court
Gary Stivers, State Board of Education
Col. E.D. Strickfaden, Idaho State Police
J.D. Williams, Office of the State Controller
Steve Wilson, Idaho State Tax Commission
*Jan Cox, Department of Administration
*Dan Hawkins, Department of Education

*Designate

Absent Members:

Pam Ahrens, Department of Administration
Senator Bert C. Marley, Idaho Senate

Others Present:

Nathan Bentley, ITRMC Staff
Dena Duncan, Dept. of Administration
Jon Eckerle, Department of Administration
Rich Elwood, ITRMC Staff
Bill Farnsworth, ITRMC Staff
Don Fournier, ITRMC Staff
Emily Gales, ITRMC Staff

Laird Justin, Office of the State Controller
Vaughn Killeen, Ada County Sheriff's Office
Mark Little, Division of Purchasing
Major Dave Rich, Idaho State Police
Dick Schultz, Dept. of Health and Welfare
Scott Somerhalder, Access Idaho
Bob Sox, Office of the State Controller

MOTION: Senator Hal Bunderson moved and Roger Parks seconded a motion to approve the April 24, 2002, ITRMC Meeting Minutes, and the motion passed unanimously.

IDAHO STATE TAX COMMISSION

(Refer to slide presentation: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m020821/tax.pdf>)

Steve Wilson provided a progress report on the State Tax Commission's (STC) **CATS (convert all tax systems) project**, which was fundamentally complete. **Project implementation was successful**, as

software configuration was finished on time (three months ahead of schedule) and budget (approximately \$500,000 under budget), and the software itself exceeded the expectations of the STC.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND WELFARE

(Refer to slide presentation: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m020821/idhw.pdf>)

Karl Kurtz spoke on public health and Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW) impacts of bioterrorism. Communication – internal and external – and technology were the two main issues, he said.

Discussion

J.D. Williams, State Controller, inquired as to whether the State of Idaho had a communications infrastructure in place to immediately notify all parties that should be involved in the case of a major incident, or if the development thereof was being dealt with as part of bioterrorism efforts of the IDHW. Kurtz advised of the Idaho Emergency Medical Services (EMS) communications system jointly housed with the Idaho State Police (ISP). ISP, first-responders for major incidents, would immediately contact the EMS, which had a protocol for contacting other agencies that should be involved. Once in the field, though, communications between these agencies was a challenge. Kurtz also advised that there were individuals investigating how we would communicate in the case of a regional attack or incident. Said ISP Director **Colonel E.D. Strickfaden**, in the evaluation of the communication process that occurred in New York City on September 11, 2001, it was found that public safety agencies were unable to talk to each other. Idaho was in the same situation, partly due to lack of a trunked radio system.

Idaho **Senator Hal Bunderson** expressed concern regarding the availability of treatment in hospitals, and wondered what was being done to correlate with local entities and encourage their involvement. Kurtz advised a lot of IDHW efforts relating to public health were directed at the district health departments. For other issues, the Bureau of Disaster Services would probably be most geared-up to be involved in the coordination of local entities. Per **Dick Schultz** (Division of Health Administrator, IDHW) in terms of hospital preparedness, the focus was on development of local education and resources capacity.

Responding to a question from Idaho House **Representative Lee Gagner**, Kurtz advised the Health Resources & Services Administration (HRSA) piece (see slide presentation) should be complete by spring 2003. Most other planning and assessments, etc. would be finished around August 2003. Overall, it was expected the project would be implemented by November 2003.

OFFICE OF THE STATE CONTROLLER

Since April 2002, four power outages had occurred; seventeen hours of productivity were lost. The SCO's state-of-the-art mainframe computer was designed to be in a totally stable environment. As this computer stored significant data, and supported about three thousand users during working hours, **a backup power supply (generator) was needed**. Said J.D. Williams, a backup power supply was absolutely critical to protecting the data stored on this computer, such as child support payments and State employee payroll.

Williams asked for the support of the Council in requesting from the Legislature the Internal Service Funds needed to secure generator capacity for the SCO data center, which would need to be housed somewhere in the Capitol Mall. He advised that in 1998, the cost would have been about \$350,000, most of which would be used for wiring and set-up. He suggested a version could be purchased to handle the Department of Administration's communication center, as well.

Williams called on **Laird Justin**, SCO, to respond to a question from Representative Lee Gagner. Justin discussed the SCO's business recovery site, or "hot site," in Boulder, Colorado. In the case of a major event, everything would have to be moved there; and the SCO could be totally operational within twenty-four hours. He also mentioned that the biggest risk to the SCO's mainframe was a "hard crash" due to loss of power.

Williams advised the Internal Service Funds needed to fund the generator would only have a relatively small, indirect impact on the General Fund. He mentioned the SCO's biggest customer, by far, was the IDHW. This was a transfer of cost, and the federal government paid most of the IDHW's IT costs.

Discussion prior to final vote: Idaho House **Representative Elmer Martinez** wondered if, procedurally, the ITRMC and SCO had to wait for legislative approval on Internal Service Funds. Williams advised it was a perpetual appropriation. The SCO actually had the monies, but needed spending authority. Also, it was not decided whether the SCO would be requesting this funding as a supplement, or as part of its annual budget.

MOTION: Senator Hal Bunderson moved and Representative Lee Gagner seconded a motion to draft a letter from the ITRMC to the Office of the Governor, the Division of Financial Management (DFM), and the co-chairs of the Joint Senate Finance–House Appropriations Committee (JFAC), recommending *supplemental* funding be provided to the Office of the State Controller for purchase of an appropriate electrical backup system to ensure mission critical systems operated by the Office of the State Controller have adequate power to operate in the event of a power outage or disaster, and the motion passed unanimously.

ITRMC IT POLICIES, ENTERPRISE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

Said **Rich Elwood**, Statewide IT Coordinator and ITRMC Staff, changes to Idaho Code § 67-5745C acknowledging the ITRMC's authority to establish policies, standards, guidelines, and conventions became effective on July 1, 2002. In recognition of this, he recommended the Council ratify all previously adopted policies, standards, and guidelines by vote.

MOTION: Karl Kurtz moved and Mary Jones seconded a motion to ratify all previously adopted ITRMC information technology policies and enterprise standards and guidelines, as a result of changes in Idaho Code § 67-5745C, and the motion passed unanimously.

Standard 3130 Video Conferencing (6-month review, no revision)

Upon six-month review by the ITRMC Staff, as well as other agencies involved, no changes were recommended for Standard 3130.

Policy 1010 IT Standards and Guidelines Framework (*revision*)

At the June 2002, Council meeting, a request was made to the Staff to draft verbiage identifying agency directors as responsible for their respective agencies' compliance with ITRMC standards and policies. Based on that request, a draft revision of IT Policy 1010, IT Standards and Guidelines Framework, had been prepared.

MOTION: J.D. Williams moved and Steve Wilson seconded a motion to approve revisions to ITRMC IT Policy 1010, Information Technology Standards and Guidelines Framework, and the motion passed unanimously.

Major Project Approval and Reporting Discussion

(Refer to handout: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m020821/itrmc&itprojects.pdf>)

Per Elwood, during a discussion on agency project review and approval at the June 2002, ITRMC meeting, the Council requested the ITRMC Staff provide language in IT Policy 2030 (IT Major Project Review) indicating there would be a periodic review of agency major project status ("*Bunderson suggested a monitoring system be developed, whereby agencies would be required to earmark and report various milestones on some basis, be it cost or performance.*") The Staff drafted language in Policy 2030, as well as Policy 2010 and Enterprise Guidelines G110 and G210, in accordance with that request. Elwood went on to explain the actions taken by the Staff when agency project profiles were received.

ITRMC and IT Projects (ITRMC Staff Proposal)

The Staff suggested Policies 2010 and 2030 be revised to require a list of projects the agency would be working on in the coming fiscal year or planning horizon be submitted with IT plan submission. Under Council direction, the ITRMC Staff would review this list of projects for fundamental information that should be generated by the agencies. A list of projects would then be prepared for Council consideration of further review (based on the Council's criteria). This list would comprise fairly major projects, such as the State Tax Commission's CATS project. (Elwood mentioned that, updates given by Steve Wilson on the STC's CATS project were a good paradigm of what the Staff was trying to do: to make agencies aware of things that needed to be done for successful projects management.)

The intent of the reviews would be to encourage agencies to develop good project management criteria for *all* projects they manage, not just large-scale ones. On a selective basis (perhaps three to five per year), representatives of those agencies listed would be asked to make a presentation to the ITRMC for formal approval. Agency projects not on the list would be considered approved by the Council, and the information would be forwarded to the Division of Financial Management (DFM). This process, said Elwood, would put the Council in more of an oversight role.

Policy 2010 IT Planning Process (revision)

Revisions to this policy would require agencies to submit a list of all IT and telecommunications projects separately, but in conjunction with, its annual IT plan.

Policy 2030 IT Major Project Review (revision)

Revisions to this policy would further define the process by which major projects were chosen for formal ITRMC review and approval. Changes would also identify the process requiring agency directors to submit, on a formal basis, a written status report on selected large projects.

Policy 2030 IT Major Project Review (alternative revision)

Alternative revisions to this policy indicated the ITRMC Staff would consider a list of agency projects, selecting certain projects that met ITRMC-established criteria. These projects would be formally presented to the Council for review and approval. Also, agency directors would be required to submit periodic and final briefings to the Council on progress relative to original project goals, cost estimates, and timelines. *Of the two draft revisions to Policy 2030, the ITRMC Staff recommended this version.*

In clarification, Elwood advised that, both revisions required more of State agencies and of the ITRMC. The alternative revision, however, expanded on the responsibilities of both in more depth.

Discussion:

Responding to a question from Senator Bunderson, Elwood advised that, the Staff envisioned the reporting process to be a simple online tool. Agencies would be asked to include the project title; a brief description; approximate dollars involved, and the fiscal year(s) they might impact; and an approximate timeline of the project in general. An agency's quarterly report could simply be a status report entailing the project management tools in use, along with timeline and budget information. Concurring with Col. Strickfaden, Elwood advised the ITRMC Staff did not have the time to review every project in great detail. Automation of the front-end process – utilizing information the State agencies should already have – would allow the Staff to select a handful of projects during the year that would require in-depth reporting. Also, the Staff anticipated initial in-depth reporting to be a formal oral presentation to the Council.

Karl Kurtz advised that, after reviewing these policies and guidelines, his department was supportive of the revisions. He added that perhaps some of the past criticisms of IDHW projects would have been remedied with the type of front-end rigor involved with IDHW projects today.

Steve Wilson reported that some IT managers expressed concern about the changes causing some additional paperwork. Other comments were to the effect that, once the policies were implemented,

some very clear guidelines and instructions needed to be produced for agency directors (and IT managers), who would be responsible for the reporting.

Wilson later wondered, on the few projects that would be formally approved by the Council, if there should be some timing involved with respect to the budget cycle; presumably, an agency would need to have that approval prior to requesting funding from the JFAC. He wasn't sure if that needed to be mentioned in the policy, or perhaps in the guidelines, suggesting that if the agency planned to go to the JFAC, projects should be submitted in time for ITRMC approval. Elwood advised the Staff was hesitant to set specific timelines (or criteria), as agencies should have the freedom and flexibility to select the time when projects needed to be brought forward.

Gary Stivers, State Board of Education, expressed concern regarding the timing involved in reporting relevant to changes in project scope. Elwood advised reporting of changes in project scope would be for notification purposes only, and should not delay project progress.

John Peay spoke in favor of the policy and guideline revisions, and believed this was something the ITRMC was formed to do. Mr. Elwood explained that an audit performed by the Legislative Services Office (LSO) pointed out that the ITRMC Staff was not requiring agencies to submit projects for review. By law, the ITRMC was not required, nor given authority, to do so. Said Peay, ITRMC review could only help in project funding requests; and an outside view, in general, could be very insightful for agencies.

Mr. Stivers, in response to Senator Bunderson, advised the universities' IT staff had reviewed the documents. He then suggested the policies should be revised to require agencies to notify the ITRMC of *significant* changes in project scope as they occur, as to avoid delays. On that note, Acting Chairman Bower commented that the following statement came across as a punitive, rather than a constructive, activity: Policy 2030, alternative revision, page one, last paragraph, third sentence, "Failure to meet planned milestones...." It was decided the sentence would be changed to read: "Changes in milestones...."

In answer to a question from Roger Parks, Rich Elwood advised the State did not use standard project methodologies and/or tools for major projects and standard reporting; each agency employed its own methodology or project management tool. Parks and Elwood further discussed the possibility of any value in the standardization of some of the State's processes and methodologies, and of creating a project office with some oversight of large projects (such as the State of Ohio had done).

Guideline G110 Agency IT Plan (revision)

Revisions to this guideline reflect suggested changes to IT Policy 2010.

Guideline G210 Major Project Summary (revision)

Revisions to this guideline reflect suggested changes to IT Policy 2030.

MOTION: Karl Kurtz moved and John Peay seconded a motion to approve revisions to ITRMC IT Policy 2010, IT Planning Process; ITRMC Staff-recommended revisions to ITRMC IT Policy 2030, IT Major Project Review, with amended language under 'Policy'; and revisions to IT Enterprise Guidelines G110, Agency IT Plan, and G210, Major Project Summary, and the motion passed unanimously.

WORK GROUP / COMMITTEE UPDATE

Public Safety, Emergency Communication Committee

E911 Systems Subcommittee

(Refer to slide presentation: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m020821/e911.pdf>, and handout: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m020821/e911-legislation.pdf>)

Ada County Sheriff **Vaughn Killeen**, Subcommittee Chairman, provided a report.

Enterprise IT Security and Business Recovery Work Group

This work group had not met recently, but conversations had taken place among key members. Per Karl Kurtz, some departments were suffering in terms of budget allocations; resources set aside for business recovery-related measures were being utilized in other areas. He advised the group would meet before the December ITRMC meeting.

Enterprise E-Mail Service Work Group

Steve Wilson explained that members of the Enterprise E-Mail Service Work Group were consulting with other states that had already implemented enterprise e-mail systems. The State of South Dakota had about 8,500 users on its base system, and was preparing to bring on 125,000 K-12 and higher education users. The State of Nevada had about 4,500 users, but was positioning itself to add others. Teleconferences were also scheduled with the States of Pennsylvania (60,000+ users) and Maine (about 11,000 users). It was hoped a recommendation would be made at the December Council meeting.

Discussion

Rich Elwood recommended that, considering 1) the number of agencies that did not use the approved e-mail server software standard (Standard 2120, approved December 2001) and 2) the State's budget situation, the Council not require any action on compliance with Standard 2120 until a recommendation was made by the Enterprise E-Mail Service Work Group. If this were acceptable, the Staff would approach the agencies, as well as the DFM, accordingly.

In response to a question from Senator Hal Bunderson, Wilson advised the group would do its best to include in its recommendation an assessment or estimate of the savings the State could expect if an enterprise-wide e-mail system were implemented.

SATAD (Secure Access to Applications and Data) Work Group

Per J.D. Williams, a request for proposal (RFP) dealing with digital authentication services was released the week of August 19, 2002. There would be a question and answer period in September, and the deadline for RFP responses was October 1.

ITRMC STAFF

2002 Digital Government Boot Camp

Rich Elwood, Statewide IT Coordinator and ITRMC Staff, provided an update on 'Boot Camp' planning.

Criminal Justice Information Integration Assessment

Elwood referred to two handouts produced by SEARCH (the National Organization for Justice Information and Statistics), a non-profit organization primarily funded by the U.S. Justice Department. This group worked closely with entities of all levels of government to promote the exchange of information across jurisdictional boundaries, and was doing an assessment of Idaho to learn where the State stood in this process. (A presentation of the assessment would be given at the December 2002,

ITRMC meeting.) The ITRMC Staff had been working closely with Bob Taylor of the Idaho State Police on this issue. Senator Hal Bunderson and John Peay were also involved.

Discussion: Per Senator Bunderson, Idaho needed to have a common system for communication between the courts, the police, and other stakeholders. He suggested the Council establish a task force or committee to evaluate SEARCH's Idaho assessment, appointing an appropriate person to chair the group. This group could provide a report and recommendations (including, perhaps, draft legislation) at the December 2002, meeting of the ITRMC.

MOTION: Senator Hal Bunderson moved and Colonel E.D. Strickfaden seconded a motion to establish an ITRMC task force to evaluate and address the SEARCH assessment on Idaho's exchange of information across jurisdictional boundaries, and to ask Colonel E.D. Strickfaden or his designee to chair the task force, and the motion passed unanimously.

Elwood suggested membership to the new task force include representatives of all stakeholders involved, i.e. local jurisdictions. Council members Mary Jones, John Peay, and Senator Bunderson, as well as Jan Cox and a Dept. of Health and Welfare representative, were identified as members of the Task Force.

Digital Government Day 2003

Bill Farnsworth, ITRMC Staff, mentioned Digital Government Day would be held on Monday, January 27.

Demonstrations

Farnsworth continued with demonstrations of the following ITRMC Staff projects: telecommunications provider database; Employee Portal; and IT asset inventory database

BRIEF UPDATES

The Council was given brief updates on the following: IDANET, Idaho's broadband digital telecommunications initiative; State Purchasing contracts (refer to handout: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m020821/purchasing.pdf>); and Access Idaho (refer to handout: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m020821/accessidaho.pdf>)

NEW BUSINESS / ADJOURNMENT

It was mentioned that **this was J.D. Williams' last meeting as a Council member**. The work done by Williams during his tenure was acknowledged. The valuable service, input, persistence, and enthusiasm he provided were very much appreciated, and members of the Council thanked him.

As there was no other new business to come before the Council, Acting Chairman Dwight Bower thanked those in attendance and adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m. The next meeting of the ITRMC – the 2002 Digital Government Boot Camp for Idaho Policy Makers – would be held on Tuesday, October 8 from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. at the Boise Centre on the Grove.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Gales
ITRMC Assistant